

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1, 3-5 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over the patent to Watanabe in view of the patent to Albright.

Claim 2 is rejected as claim 1, and further in view of the patent to Takano.

Claims 6-8 are rejected as claims 3 and 5, and further in view of the patent to Oda.

Claim 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as claim 1 and further in view of the patent to Fakult.

Also, the drawings are objected to, and the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the drawings, applicant has submitted herewith a copy of the drawings with the corrections

marked in red. It is believed that the Examiner's grounds for the objection to the drawings in paragraphs 1 and 2 should be considered as no longer tenable.

As for the interior and exterior location of the cooling system, it is respectfully submitted that the first cooling system which is respectfully submitted that one cooling system which is provided for an auxiliary cooling is shown in Figure 3, while another cooling system which is provided for interior cooling is shown in Figures 4 and 5.

As for the Examiner's rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, it is respectfully submitted that the rotor and stator each are composed of structural elements especially layered and joined together metal sheets as defined in claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to simply say that the metal sheets of the structural elements of the stator have a suitable geometry for creating the stator directly. As for the base body of claim 1, the base body is an element identified with reference numeral 15 in the specification.

Claim 20 which is objected by the Examiner has been canceled.

Applicants have also canceled claims 3-6 and submitted two new independent claims 24 and 25 which contain the features of canceled claims. It is therefore believed that claims 24 and 25 does not raise any new issues for examination and search.

Turning now to the Examiner's rejection of the claims over the art, it is respectfully submitted that in accordance with the present invention as defined in claim 1 that the stator and the rotor are each composed of structural elements comprising layered and joined together metal sheets which are stacked on one another and therefore the structural elements of the rotor and the stator are at least maximally preshaped. With the metal sheets of the structural elements of the stator having a geometry for creating the stator directly, and the metal sheets of the structural elements of the rotor forming a base body of the rotor.

These features of the present invention are not disclosed in the prior art applied by the Examiner.

The patent to Watanabe discloses a generator but not a stator generator with a riveted laminated stator. However, it does not disclose a rotor which has a body composed of layered and joined together metal

sheets. Thus, this reference does not teach the new features of the present invention as defined in claim 1.

The other references also do not teach the new features of the present invention as defined in claim 1. It is therefore believed that the new features of the present invention as defined in claim 1 are not disclosed in any single reference, and can not be derived from the references either taken singly or in combination with one another.

It is therefore believed that claim 1 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

The Examiner's attention is also respectfully directed to the features of claims 24 and 25. Each of these claims define the combination of an internal cooling system and external cooling system, which however forms slightly differently. The patent to Watanabe discloses exclusively a generator, while the present invention deals with a stator generator which produces much more heat in the starter mode than in the generator mode. Applicant has recognized this problem and disclosed a stator-generator which there are two cooling systems, in particular an external cooling system

and an internal cooling system in the rotor, which are designed in correspondence with the specific embodiment.

These features of the present invention which are now defined in claims 24 and 25 are also not disclosed in the references and can not be derived from them either taken singly or in combination with one another.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 24 and 25 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the other claims these claims depend on claim 1, they share its presumably allowable features and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be

carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233